



Dr. Fred Schwarz

# The Schwarz Report



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 49, Number 10

October 2009

## From Pravda With Love

by Stanislav Mishin

The following article by Stanislav Mishin was originally entitled “American capitalism gone with a whimper.” Printed in a formerly communist newspaper speaks volumes to its content. In case some of our readers find his reference to Wall Street and Marxism questionable, our recommendation would be a read of Antony C. Sutton’s *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*.

It must be said, that like the breaking of a great dam, the American descent into Marxism is happening with breathtaking speed, against the back drop of a passive, hapless sheeple, excuse me dear reader, I meant people.

True, the situation has been well prepared on and off for the past century, especially the past twenty years. The initial testing ground was conducted upon our Holy Russia and a bloody test it was. But we Russians would not just roll over and give up our freedoms and our souls, no matter how much money Wall Street poured into the fists of the Marxists.

Those lessons were taken and used to properly prepare the American populace for the surrender of their freedoms and souls, to the whims of their elites and betters.

First, the population was dumbed down through a politicized and substandard education system based on pop culture, rather than the classics. Americans know more about their favorite TV dramas than the drama in DC that directly affects their lives. They care more for their “right” to choke down a McDonalds burger or a Burger King burger than for their constitutional rights. Then they turn around and lecture us about our rights and about our “democracy.” Pride blinds the foolish.

Then their faith in God was destroyed, until their churches, all tens of thousands of different “branches and denominations” were for the most part little more than Sunday circuses and their televangelists and top protestant mega preachers were more than happy to sell out their souls and flocks to be on the “winning” side of one pseudo Marxist politician or another. Their flocks may complain, but when explained that they would be on the “winning” side, their flocks were ever so quick to reject Christ in hopes for earthly power. Even our Holy Orthodox churches are scandalously liberalized in America.

The final collapse has come with the election of Barack Obama. His speed in the past three months has been truly impressive. His spending and money printing has been record setting, not just in America's short history but in the world. If this keeps up for more than another year, and there is no sign that it will not, America at best will resemble the Weimar Republic and at worst Zimbabwe.

These past two weeks have been the most breath taking of all. First came the announcement of a planned redesign of the American Byzantine tax system, by the very thieves who used it to bankroll their thefts, loses, and swindles of hundreds of billions of dollars. These make our Russian oligarchs look like little more than ordinary street thugs in comparison. Yes, the Americans have beat our own thieves in sheer volume. Should we congratulate them?

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman. The Crusade’s address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.

These men, of course, are not an elected panel but made up of appointees picked from the very financial oligarchs and their henchmen who are now gorging themselves on trillions of American dollars, in one bailout after another. They are also usurping the rights, duties, and powers of the American congress (parliament). Again, congress has put up little more than a whimper to their masters.

Then came Barack Obama's command that GM's (General Motors) president step down from leadership of his company. That is correct, dear reader, in the land of "pure" free markets, the American president now has the power, the self-given power, to fire CEOs, and we can assume other employees of private companies, at will. Come hither, go thither, the centurion commands his minions.

So it should be no surprise, that the American president has followed this up with a "bold" move of declaring that he and another group of unelected, chosen stooges will now redesign the entire automotive industry and will even be the guarantee of automobile policies. I am sure that if given the chance, they would happily try and redesign it for the whole of the world, too. Prime Minister Putin, less than two months ago, warned Obama and UK's Blair, not to follow the path to Marxism, it only leads to disaster. Apparently, even though we suffered 70 years of this Western sponsored horror show, we know nothing, as foolish, drunken Russians, so let our "wise" Anglo-Saxon fools find out the folly of their own pride.

Again, the American public has taken this with barely a whimper . . . but a "freeman" whimper.

So, should it be any surprise to discover that the Democratically controlled Congress of America is working on passing a new regulation that would give the American Treasury department the power to set "fair" maximum salaries, evaluate performance, and control how private companies give out pay raises and bonuses? Congressman Barney Frank, a social pervert basking in his homosexuality (of course, amongst the modern, enlightened American societal norm, as well as that of the general West, homosexuality is not only not a looked down upon life choice, but is often praised as a virtue) and his Marxist enlightenment, has led this effort. He stresses that this only affects companies that receive government monies, but it is retroactive and taken to a logical extreme, this would include any company or industry that has ever received a tax break or incentive.

The Russian owners of American companies and industries should look thoughtfully at this and the option of closing their facilities down and fleeing the land of the Red as fast as possible. In other words, divest while there is still value left.

The proud American will go down into his slavery without a fight, beating his chest and proclaiming to the world, how free he really is. The world will only snicker.

—Pravda.Ru, April 27, 2009

## On the Road to Communism by John Strachey

In 1936, John Strachey wrote *The Theory and Practice of Socialism*, published by Random House. The following article is a portion of chapter 11, entitled "Socialism and Communism Distinguished." With the socialists in charge of the U.S. House of Representatives and White House, Strachey's book is a clear vision of what's in store for the United States. And with the appointment of Van Jones [recently deposed] to be the "green jobs czar," an individual who has not sought to hide his radical communist history (*Worldnetdaily*, August 27, 2009 article by Aaron Kelin), the relationship between socialism and communism becomes more than an academic study.

It is also important to note that Strachey himself was an ardent defender of communism and his heroes are Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. He approves Stalin's charge that "Men must be grown as carefully and attentively as a gardener grows a favorite fruit tree." (p. 143).

Under communism consumable goods and services will be distributed according to need, and work will be performed according to ability. Do we mean by that, the reader will at once ask, that everybody is to be allowed to have as much of everything as he likes, and, more extraordinary proposal still, that nobody is to be compelled to do more work than he wants to? Yes, this is just what is meant. But is this not an utterly impossible form of social organization, unworkable both because there would never be enough of everything to go round, and because most people would not work at all, unless they had to do so in order to earn their livings? Yes, such a system of society is unworkable today and will be unworkable tomorrow, when the workers of Britain and America are facing the job of building up a new economic system. That is why it is not proposed as the immediate successor to capitalism.

This principle of distribution has been defined in a well-known phrase, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Men will be expected to contribute service to society according to their abilities and to take from

the social store of wealth according to their needs.” We shall find on examination that this principle of distribution (and not equality), however impracticable its early adoption may be, is the only one which can satisfy our vague and at present conflicting feelings as to what would be just. It alone will permit of the full development of human beings, and will eliminate altogether coercion from human affairs. Nor, when certain essential conditions have been fulfilled, will it be impracticable to adopt it.

We have now outlined two distinct forms of social organization. First, we described a system of planned production for use in which the products are distributed in accordance with the quantity and quality of the work done. This is socialism. Now we have outlined a social system which is also based upon planned production for use, but in which the products are distributed according to need, and work is done according to ability. This is communism.

We also saw that it is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is, accordingly, proposed to establish socialism as something which we can put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism.

This is how Lenin used, and Stalin uses, the two words socialism and communism. Marx, on the other hand, called a system of planned production for use, which distributed its products in accordance with the quality and quantity of work done, the first stage of communism, rather than socialism. The usage adopted by Lenin and Stalin seems well established, however, and it is convenient. So in this book we shall use the word socialism to describe the one system and communism to describe the other. This, then, is the difference between communism and socialism.

It remains to enquire whether communism, as distinct from socialism, is not a mere dream. It is not. It will be possible to base society upon this principle, as soon as certain psychological and material pre-requisites have been established. It is the function of the socialist system of planned production for use, and distribution according to work done, to establish the pre-requisites of this higher form of society, which is communism.

Two things must be accomplished before there can be any possibility of basing society upon the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” First, we must have the technical ability to create super-abundance. The means of production must

be developed to a much higher point than they have yet reached, even in Britain and America. We will have to equip ourselves with machines and productive plants of every kind by means of which we can satisfy all our wants with a minimum of labour, and especially of toilsome, painful, or degrading labour. Science will have to discover ways of eliminating all of that huge amount of dreary, monotonous, primitive, and heavy labour which is performed, and some of which is necessary, today.

This technical pre-requisite to communism may be very much nearer the possibility of accomplishment than we are accustomed to suppose. The mere application to productive processes of the scientific knowledge which has already been attained, but which, because of the decay of our present economic system, is not used, would, we are told by the younger scientists, vastly increase our capacity to produce. To this must be added the fact, which we may already deduce from Soviet experience, that science, freed from its present enslavement to profit, bounds forward.

The rate at which, living under a socialist system of planned production for use, men can bring their environment under their command (for this is the broadest possible way of putting the point) is very rapid indeed. It would be futile to guess how long it will be after the abolition of capitalism in Britain and America before the technical basis necessary to give everyone as much of everything as he likes to have can be established. It may be that a hundred years would be too short an estimate; it may be that it would be much too long. Moreover, it is not particularly worth while even to attempt such a guess, for the second condition necessary for the appearance of communism will almost certainly take the longer to achieve.

Before there can be any possibility of society giving everyone as much of everything as he likes to have, and asking from him only what work he desires to give, human beings must be given time to adapt themselves to the extreme reversal in the nature of this environment which any approximation to such a society will constitute. Up till now the condition of existence for nine-tenths of the human race has been unremitting and all-absorbing toil. To this toil everything else has had to be sacrificed. Nor has the extraordinary development of our productive powers during the last hundred and fifty years done much to alter this apparently eternal condition of human life. For, as we have seen, under the peculiar economic arrangement which we call capitalism, almost the whole of this increase in our power to produce has been automatically reserved

for the still further increase of those powers.

For a race accustomed from its appearance on the earth to scarcity and toil to be suddenly plunged into an environment in which a very moderate amount of pleasant work will suffice to provide plenty of everything for everybody will be a reversal of fortune without parallel. It would be unreasonable to expect an even approximate adaptation to such a change in less than two or three generations. But this adaptation, too, will begin just so soon as the relative plenty and security of a socialist system is established.

It may be that we should waste and spoil the social store of wealth if we had free access to it. It may be that we should idle all our days away in meaningless leisure if we were not compelled to work for our livings. It may be, in a word, that if we suddenly strayed into the garden of universal plenty we should barbarously misuse and destroy it. But we have no right to suppose that our descendants will be as churlish or as childish as we are.

Men and women who have never had the opportunity to possess the goods and services necessary to more than a wretched existence might gorge starved appetites. But to the inhabitants of a land in which want and insecurity were unknown, the idea of a man taking more of any particular good than he needed might well seem unaccountably odd. Again, we should be able to understand how work could become the main delight of life, a delight which men would not dream of foregoing. For already those fortunate few amongst us whose work is pleasant and interesting find in it one of the most enduring satisfactions of their lives.

In any case, it is always rash to declare that such and such a development in the way of life of mankind is impossible. Today we smile indulgently at our great-grandfathers for declaring the railway an absurdity, applaud Icarus, and scoff at the generations of practical men who invented the myth in order to warn us of the folly of attempting to fly. Nothing is easier than such retrospective enlightenment. What is not so easy is to avoid committing the same mistakes as to the possibilities open to future generations. In this matter we run the risk of cutting very sorry figures for posterity. For, as Engels remarks, the generations which will put us right are likely to be far more numerous than those which we so patronisingly correct. The world itself is very young. Life is in its childhood. The human race has only just been born.

—John Strachey, *The Theory and Practice of Socialism*, pp. 120-125

## Barack Obama: The Most Radical Czar of All

by Gary Bauer

Have you heard about the latest Obama czar to stir up controversy for his extreme policy positions and radical affiliations?

I'm not talking about Van Jones, the recently deposed "Green Jobs Czar." Sure Jones has an affinity for Marxist ideology and dabbles in 9/11-was-an-inside-job lunacy. But this guy makes all the fuss surrounding Jones look downright humdrum by comparison.

He's got ties to domestic terrorists, believes babies who survive abortions do not deserve protection, and for decades embraced a mentor who thinks America deserved what it got on that horrific day eight years ago. And he's the most powerful czar of them all: Barack Obama.

Many Americans are aghast that President Obama appointed a radical to a key advisor's position. But they shouldn't be surprised. Obama's always been most comfortable on the fringes.

In his book *Dreams From My Father*, Obama writes about how he chose his associations while in college. "To avoid being mistaken for a sellout, I chose my friends carefully. The more politically active black students. The foreign students. The Chicanos. The Marxist professors and structural feminists."

The radicalism of Van Jones and other Obama czars merely reflects the president's own views and is squarely within the mainstream of the political Left.

Van Jones insists he's a victim of a "vicious smear campaign." But most of the conservative criticism involved simply reciting Jones' own statements back to him. He can complain all he wants, but these are positions that in front of certain audiences Jones would have been delighted to trumpet, and associations without which he probably never could have ascended to the point of being considered for the administration post in the first place.

The mainstream media, when it finally acknowledged the story, tried to absolve the Obama administration of any wrongdoing. The most the *Washington Post* could concede was that the controversy "revealed a lapse in the administration's vetting procedures . . ."

But it is implausible to suggest that the Obama administration was in the dark about Jones' beliefs and associations. Obama key aide Valerie Jarrett said only a few weeks ago that they were "delighted to be able to recruit him," and "we were watching him." A White House

source told *The American Spectator* this week, “You don’t fill a position like this without his hire being approved at a couple of different levels at least.”

Let’s be honest: The Obama administration knew what Jones believed. It’s mainstream Americans who were in the dark.

As night follows day, liberal journalists pointed to Jones’ skin color to accuse his critics of racism. David Sirota wrote at the Huffington Post, “. . . let’s just be honest—the fact that the right chose to mount a hysteria campaign specifically around an African American, Jones, was no coincidence.”

The race-baiting Left’s ability to confuse correlation (criticizing a radical leftist who happens to be black) with causation (criticizing a radical leftist because he is black) never ceases to amaze me. In truth, the only color conservative critics of the Obama administration were looking for is red, as in Communist Red. And Jones is a professed Communist.

Jones is only one of many radical Obama czars. Science Czar John Holdren is an environmental extremist whose writing suggests he once supported coercive population control measures including forced abortion as well and adding sterilants to drinking water.

Cass Sustein is Obama’s Regulatory Czar. Sustein has written in support of granting animals legal standing in civil litigation (a right, incidentally, he would not extend to unborn persons), banning hunting, and encouraging people to eat less meat.

Then there’s Mark Lloyd, Obama’s Diversity Czar with the Federal Communications Commission. Lloyd is an admirer of Hugo Chavez and supports reinstating the Fairness Doctrine, which would muzzle conservative talk radio.

It is into the hands of those and the dozens of other “special advisors” that Obama has placed a level of unaccountable power that even cabinet secretaries do not possess.

At least one liberal is concerned. Democratic Senator Robert Byrd sent a letter to Obama stating: “the rapid and easy accumulation of power by the White House staff can threaten the constitutional system of check and balances . . . as presidential assistants and advisors, these White House staffers are not accountable for their actions to the Congress, to cabinet officials, or to virtually anyone but the president. They rarely testify before congress and often shield the information and decision making process behind the assertion of executive privilege. In too many instances, White House staff have been allowed to inhibit openness and transparency, and reduce accountability.”

Byrd wrote that letter in February. Since then, President Obama has added more than a dozen new czars.

This week GOP Congressman Patrick McHenry called for all of Obama’s 32 plus czars to testify before Congress before assuming their positions. I think that’s a good idea.

But here is the dirty little secret: The liberal left does not consider Jones and his ilk extremists. These guys weren’t invited into Obama’s inner circle because the president’s team was ignorant of their histories. Nor were they given their posts in spite of their extreme records. They were elevated to their positions because of their radical views.

These high-profile figures are only the tip of the iceberg. Countless political appointees holding the same views operate in a vast bureaucracy, put in place by Obama, and all are working day and night to remake the country in their image.

But there is a silver lining to this story of unaccountable, unelected officials seizing political power. It’s the story of a grassroots revival of good, old-fashioned democracy. Citizen involvement was seen at town hall meetings and tea parties. And people’s voices have been heard on the internet, talk radio, and even during the president’s healthcare address to Congress this week.

Van Jones was forced to leave office after ordinary Americans learned what kind of person President Obama had chosen. An engaged electorate is a powerful thing, and their attention is turning to the other un-vetted officials Obama picked. Other czars might want to get their resumes together. Who knows, czar unemployment rates could eventually reach the level that the rest of the country is suffering from.

—*Human Events.com*, September 11, 2009

---

## Green/Red Jobs Czar

by Robert Knight

Have you ever been to a White House event?

I have. Before they let me anywhere near the place, I had to submit basic info that allowed them to vet me. But that was back when W lived there.

When someone is appointed to a federal executive post, the vetting process is far more elaborate. The Secret Service understandably wants to know who’s within spittin’ distance of the president. The White House staff want to know if there’s anything lurking in the past that will jump out and bite them. The media want to know whether there’s anything they can use to fit those teeth for the bite.

Which is why the media's excuse for Obama's choosing radical Van Jones as "Green Jobs" czar is so absurd.

The official line they've all swallowed (or at least use) is that poor Mr. Obama must have been misinformed about Mr. Jones. On Sept. 7, the *Washington Post* ran this headline exculpating Obama: "In Adviser's Resignation, Vetting Bites Obama." Yeah, that's the ticket. The article quotes an anonymous "White House official" who says that "Jones's past was not studied as intensively as that of other advisers because of his relatively low rank."

A far more likely explanation is that the Obama team knew full well what Jones was about and saw no problem. As a disciple of radical community organizer Saul Alinsky, why would Barack recoil from a guy who was using Alinsky's methods to a T? Besides, it's clear the White House was thrilled with Jones' past. Fox's Glenn Beck ran tape of White House Senior Advisor Valerie Jarrett boasting that they had been watching Jones' activities for years and finally "were so delighted to recruit him into the White House."

From the *Washington Post* to the *Los Angeles Times*, to the TV networks and news magazines, they ignored the growing controversy over Jones' communist background as it built over the past couple of weeks. Beck led the charge, along with Breitbart.com and blogs such as Gateway Pundit, which broke the story about Jones being a 9/11 "truther." The "truthers" are the guys in tinfoil hats who say the Bush Administration either knew about the attacks beforehand or was complicit. *The New York Times* did not cover any of this until Jones resigned on Sept. 6.

At the schizophrenic *Wall Street Journal*, the truth-telling editorial page noted on Sept. 8 that Jones "has been a leading young light of the leftwing political movement for many years" with a "long trail of extreme comments and left-wing organizations." Meanwhile, some leftwing activists posing as reporters over on the news page blamed "the right" and said Jones "resigned, after conservatives seized on a series of controversial statements." Great *seizers'* ghost!

Jones did not exactly go quietly. His written statement says that "opponents of reform have mounted a vicious smear campaign against me. They are using lies and distortions to distract and divide." Well, for it to be a smear or lie, it's got to be inaccurate. Even the drive-by media have finally reported the ugly facts about Jones' involvement

with the "truthers," and as a founder of the now-disbanded Bay Area communist group Standing Together to Organize a Revolutionary Movement (STORM).

The *Post* delicately describes STORM as having "Marxist roots." Yes, and trunk and branches and fruit. Reclaiming Revolution, a history of the organization published in 2004, relates that it was an outgrowth of the early '90s group Roots Against War (RAW), which "laid the groundwork for the next decade of revolutionary politics among young people of color in the Bay Area." (p. 5) A quick analysis is available on the website of Reformed evangelical conservative David Westerfield. After RAW disbanded in 1992, the activists reformed as STORM in 1994, with "a political commitment to the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism" (p. 51). STORM disbanded in December 2002.

Contrast the utter lack of interest in this juicy story with the *Washington Post's* multiple-article obsession, editorial, and cartoons over a research paper advocating Christian views of public policy written by Virginia GOP gubernatorial candidate Robert McDonnell in 1989—twenty years ago. The *Post* sure has a nose for scandal. Are Woodward and Bernstein embarrassed yet?

One of the less important charges against Jones was his public use of the a-word to describe Republicans who are resisting the health care takeover. The Left routinely uses foul language, so this unwise remark should not have come as a surprise. To sample the gutter terms, take a peek at the leftie Websites Huffington Post or MoveOn. Leftists flavor their commentary with profanity the way cows fertilize a field. But who can blame the Left for venting? It's been a whole seven months, and we still don't have communism, just major elements of socialism and a scheme to saddle our children and grandchildren with literally trillions in debt.

If the opposition is smart, it will portray Jones as the poster boy for the other party's radical core. Rep. Mike Pence (R-Ind.), who called for Jones' resignation on the day before it happened, has called for inquiries into all of Obama's "czars." That's a good start.

The Left thought their fully owned subsidiary media would protect them against their own worst instincts. Judging by how the media continue to carry water for them over the Jones debacle, you can't say they aren't trying.

—*Townhall.com*, September 9, 2009

### The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at [www.schwarz-report.org](http://www.schwarz-report.org). This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

# Van Jones: “I Was a Communist”

by Aaron Klein

More than five months after the Obama administration announced the hiring of its “green jobs czar,” Van Jones, the White House has refused to explain whether it knew of Jones admitted black nationalist and radical communist history and just who hired the adviser.

Also questions continue to fester about how Jones, who has an arrest history, passed security clearances for his White House position.

Cliff Kincaid, an editor at Accuracy in Media, attempted to answer some of these questions when he used the Freedom of Information Act in April to request immediate access to all documents relating to the appointment of Jones to the White House Council on Environmental Quality, where he served as special adviser for green jobs, enterprise and innovation.

The council, which hired Jones, replied that it “searched its records system and found none responsive” for Kincaid’s request.

The council recommended more information be sought at the White House Press Office, which did not respond to Kincaid’s requests about how Jones was hired.

The White House also did not reply to numerous WND requests for comment.

The Fox News Channel’s Glenn Beck program similarly asked the White House whether it was aware of Jones’ radical history.

The White House provided the following response: “Mr. Jones is entirely focused on one policy goal: building clean energy incentives which create 21st century jobs that improve energy efficiency and utilize renewable resources.”

The lack of available information concerning Jones is unusual since the Obama transition team previously touted it developed a seven-page questionnaire that included 63 questions about an applicant’s background and qualifications for a federal job. Kincaid pointed out that CNN reported the document was to be for “every candidate for Cabinet and other high-ranking positions in the incoming administration.”

However, there is no indication Jones ever filled out the document.

Also, there are open questions as to how Jones obtained a White House security clearance. He spent time in jail several times, including in the wake of the 1992 Rodney King riots in Los Angeles.

Jones was the leader and founder of a radical communist and black nationalist group, the communist revolutionary

organization Standing Together to Organize a Revolutionary Movement, or STORM. The organization had its roots in a grouping of black people organizing to protest the first Gulf War. STORM was formally founded in 1994, becoming one of the most influential and active radical groups in the San Francisco Bay area.

STORM worked with known communist leaders. It led the charge in black protests against various issues, including a local attempt to pass Proposition 21, a ballot initiative that sought to increase the penalties for violent crimes and require more juvenile offenders to be tried as adults.

The leftist blog Machete 48 identifies STORM’s influences as “third-worldist Marxism (and an often vulgar Maoism).”

Speaking to the East Bay Express, Jones said he first became radicalized in the wake of the 1992 Rodney King riots, during which time he was arrested.

“I was a rowdy nationalist on April 28th, and then the verdicts came down on April 29th,” he said. “By August, I was a communist.

“I met all these young radical people of color—I mean really radical: communists and anarchists. And it was, like, ‘This is what I need to be a part of.’ I spent the next 10 years of my life working with a lot of those people I met in jail, trying to be a revolutionary,” he said.

Trevor Loudon, a researcher and opponent of communism who runs the New Zeal blog, identified several Bay Area communists who worked with STORM, including Elizabeth Martinez, who helped advise Jones’ Ella Baker Human Rights Center, which Jones founded to advocate civil justice. Jones and Martinez also attended a “Challenging White Supremacy” workshop together.

Martinez was a long time Maoist who went on to join the Communist Party USA breakaway organization Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, or CCDS, in the early 1990s, according to Loudon. Martinez still serves on the CCDS council and is also a board member of the Movement for a Democratic Society, where she sits alongside former Weathermen radicals Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn.

One of STORM’s newsletters featured a tribute to Amilcar Cabral, the late Marxist revolutionary leader of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands.

The tribute is noteworthy because Jones reportedly named his son after Cabral and reportedly concludes every e-mail with a quote from the communist leader.

STORM eventually fell apart amid bickering among its leaders.

Jones then moved on to environmentalism. He used his Ella Baker Center to advocate “inclusive” environmentalism and launch a Green-Collar Jobs Campaign, which led to the nation’s first Green Jobs Corps in Oakland, Calif.

At the Clinton Global Initiative in 2007, Jones announced the establishment of Green For All, which in 2008 held a national green conference in which most attendees were black. Jones also released a book, *The Green Collar Economy*, which debuted at No. 12 on the *New York Times* 'bestseller list—the first environmental book written by an African American to make the list.

Jones, formerly a self-described “rowdy black nationalist,” boasted in a 2005 interview with the left-leaning East Bay Express that his environmental activism was a means to fight for racial and class “justice.”

Jones was president and founder of Green For All, a nonprofit organization that advocates building a so-called inclusive green economy.

Until recently, Jones was a longtime member of the board of Apollo Alliance, a coalition of labor, business, environmental, and community leaders that claims on its website to be “working to catalyze a clean energy revolution that will put millions of Americans to work in a new generation of high-quality, green-collar jobs.”

—*WorldNetDaily*, August 26, 2009

---

## Chavez: To Moscow With Love

Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez cemented a closer alliance with Russia on Thursday, recognizing two pro-Russian rebel regions of Georgia as independent and securing arms supplies and loans in return.

Chavez's move to recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia is a rare diplomatic success for Russia, which has tried for over a year to persuade its allies to follow its lead and treat the two small regions as sovereign. Only Nicaragua had agreed so far.

“Venezuela from today is joining in the recognition of the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia,” Chavez told President Dmitry Medvedev through a translator at the Russian leader's residence outside Moscow.

Caracas would start the process of establishing diplomatic relations with them soon, he added.

The rest of the world views the two regions, which threw off Georgian rule in the early 1990s and have run their own affairs since, as an integral part of Georgia. The issue has become a key sticking point in relations between the West and Russia.

President Dmitry Medvedev thanked Chavez, who is

visiting Moscow, for his support. Shortly afterwards he said Russia would supply tanks and other weapons sought by Venezuela.

“We will supply Venezuela the weapons that Venezuela asks for,” Medvedev said after their talks.

“Why not tanks? Without question, we have good tanks. If our friends want our tanks, we will deliver them.”

No details were given of the arms deal but Russia's state RIA news agency quoted a military source as saying Venezuela would buy 100 tanks for \$500 million. The two sides also announced plans for a joint bank with capital of \$4 billion to finance their projects.

Venezuela wants to beef up its weaponry to resist what Chavez terms U.S. imperialism in Latin America. Tension has also been rising with neighboring Colombia, a close U.S. ally and historic rival of Venezuela.

Venezuela and Colombia came close to war last year and Colombian President Alvaro Uribe has accused Chavez of supporting FARC Marxist rebels fighting Bogota. Venezuela objects to Colombia allowing the United States to use its military bases for anti-drug operations.

Latin American diplomats in Moscow were concerned by the potential impact of the arms deal on regional security.

“If the tanks are something Russia is sending for immediate dispatch, this will destabilize the region,” one diplomat said. “If it is an order which has to be manufactured and delivered over coming years, then it is more of a political act.”

The recognition of sovereignty is also controversial—especially with South Ossetia because the small region is located close to the Georgian capital Tbilisi, has a population in the low tens of thousands and survives on Russian aid.

Generous Kremlin military and financial support for Abkhazia and South Ossetia has soured relations with Georgia and provoked Western condemnation. Tbilisi argues that Moscow's actions amount to a de facto annexation of the territories.

“This recognition—bought by Russia with money and weapons—bears no relation to the will of the Venezuelan people,” Georgia's Foreign Ministry said in a statement.

“With this decision, the Venezuelan dictator legitimizes the ethnic cleansing that took place,” it said, referring to Tbilisi's claims that Russia turned a blind eye to armed militias it said looted Georgian villages in last year's war.

—*Reuters*, September 10, 2009